

REMARKS


Examiner Kailash C. Srivastava contacted the undersigned on February 9, 2009 indicating that he had taken over prosecution of the above-identified patent application from Examiner Amanda P. Wood. After initially indicating to the undersigned that the case was in condition for allowance, the Examiner contacted the undersigned again requesting that the amendment to the claims detailed in the Interview Summary be made in order to overcome the previous Examiner's written description rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The undersigned informed the Examiner that this ground of rejection was already overcome in the Response filed September 8, 2008. Specifically, the undersigned explained that even though the recited "output" was already shown by name in the drawings and described in the specification, the *ipsissima verba* of the phrase "output part" was added to the description, thereby rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph moot. The amendment is fully supported by the specification as filed, as indicated in the previously filed Response (e.g., page 4, first full paragraph).

For these reasons, the undersigned informed the Examiner that the recitation of an "output part" in the claims already enjoys ample support in the specification, and that the amendment the Examiner proposes in the Interview Summary is unwarranted and cannot be justified. The undersigned indicated that if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is maintained in a future Office Action, Applicant will likely seek relief through an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

If Office personnel have any questions relating to the present communication, it is respectfully requested that they contact the undersigned agent directly at (312)-321-4257.

Respectfully submitted,


Gregory H. Zayia
Registration No. 48,059
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200